

Quality Counts Peer Reviewer Rubric

The Quality Counts grant is competitive. A team of expert peer reviewers with experience in school improvement, management and direct experiences with charter schools will review grant applications. Each application will be reviewed a minimum of two times and may include further adjustments or reductions after awards are made. The review of the applications will utilize the criteria listed within the rubric included in the request for proposals.

Proposals that receive higher scores increase their likelihood of approval and receipt of funding at the requested levels. Department staff shall conduct a final review of all applications to ensure the application was completed with fidelity and complies with all requirements. Department staff shall determine the final budget for each subgrant recipient and will determine whether proposed activities are reasonable, allocable, and necessary. If the page limit of the application is exceeded, reviewers may reduce the total score by up to 10%.

Pre-Requisites Satisfied:

1. Accountability Grade:

- a. Accountability-Data provided for years prior to 2013-2014. No current data provided.
- b. Evidence of strong academic results: Based on DOE COMPASS, the current school is below the state ISTEP average on ISTEP+ but has improved every year creating an upward trend. For IREAD, the school is below the state average the last two years on IREAD but demonstrating a downward trend.

On Page 202-Mayor's Office Accountability Framework Overview notes:

1.3 (15/16)-Does not meet standard (demonstrate that students are improving the longer they are there)

2. No Corrective Action:

- a. Student Safety-Meets standard.
- b. School Finance-Meet/Exceeds standards for 2.1 and 2.2, however, the previous two years on 2.3 (demonstrate adequate financial management and systems) the school did not meet the standard.
- c. Operational Management-Meets standard.
- d. Statutory/Regulatory Compliance in LRE and ELL-Meets standard.

3. School is not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement:

- a. Economically Disadvantaged- Not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement
- b. Major Racial and Ethnic Groups- Not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

c. Students with Disabilities- Not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

d. Students with limited English proficiency- Not identified for Targeted Support and Improvement

Peer Reviewer Instructions: The peer reviewer shall determine the band that best fits the holistic evaluation of each section in the grant narrative and then determine the strength within that band to arrive at a score. The peer reviewer shall provide a comment if a 0, 1, or highest score is assigned.

Optional Competitive Preference Priority 1 (CPP1): Early Childhood, Postsecondary, and/or Rural Areas

0	1	2	3
Not included in the application; model will not focus upon any of the priority areas	Area of focus is indicated, but expected targets and outcomes, and specific populations are not mentioned.	Area of focus is clearly defined, expected targets and outcomes are described, specific populations are mentioned.	Area of focus is clearly defined, expected targets and outcomes are clearly described and supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and assessable goals. Unique populations are clearly defined and described quantitatively and qualitatively.
Comments: N/A			

1. Charter School Vision and Expected Outcomes: 4

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Charter School vision included, no clear indication of community need/community communication, curriculum framework mentioned but not expanded upon, no clear description of how educational program will meet Indiana's academic standards or how students will develop 21 st Century skills, nor a clearly defined sustainability plan beyond the life of the grant.	Charter school vision included, community need and communication plan outlined. Curriculum framework, key instructional practices, and curriculum development guide outlined. Methodology for the proposed program to reach all learners is explained. A plan for how students will develop 21 st Century skills is present and a sustainability plan post-grant is outlined.	Charter school vision is fully developed and described, evidence to support community need for this program is clearly defined and presented, and a communication plan is clearly described. Curriculum framework, key instructional practices, and research to support the usage of these is clearly articulated. Specificity is used to demonstrate how the proposed program will support all students in meeting/exceeding Indiana's academic standards. The program's ability to help prepare students for college or develop 21 st Century skills is clearly defined. A sustainable, viable plan is articulated to continue the program beyond the life of the grant.

Comments: Speaks to Backwards Design but documentation doesn't support their understanding of this concept in the Assessment section or in the sample lesson plans provided.

2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers: 6

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Key Personnel are identified. Data and analysis to support the program are vaguely described. No evidence that the proposed program will deliver strong growth and student achievement is presented. No analysis is presented.	Key Personnel are identified and described. Data and analysis that support the program are described. Some connections are made between the data and the program's ability to deliver academic growth and student achievement. Analysis is present but does not reference school's Annual Performance report from DOE Compass.	Key Personnel are identified and their qualifications are clearly described and relevant to the proposed program. Data and analysis that support the ability of the proposed program or replicated program are presented and demonstrate clear evidence that the proposed program will deliver strong academic growth and student achievement. Analysis references school's Annual Performance report from DOE Compass or similar report.
Comments: Developers appear to be well-qualified and invested in the success of the schools.			

3. Charter School Goals: 7

0	1-3	4-6	7-9
No description provided or cited.	Description is partial, vague, or unclear. Inadequately addresses academic outcomes of students in a measurable format or include achievement data. Community communication plan is vague or not present.	Goals to address academic needs are described and connections are made to student outcomes. Methods for measuring success towards goals are mentioned but may be unclear. Student achievement data is referenced. A community communication plan is outlined to describe school goals.	Specific, measurable goals are clearly described and how academic outcomes of all students will be addressed and the measurement of progress towards goals is articulated. Student achievement data from state content assessment is included and incorporated into the explanation. A communication plan that has been well-thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders has been articulated with specificity.
Comments: Most goals are measurable and achievable but the one for administrators on community outreach is noted but not a factor on the RISE evaluation.			

4. Use of CSP Funding: 4

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Budget Narrative is partial, vague, or unclear. Few costs are reasonable or necessary. Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue program	Budget narrative addresses most line items and shows connection between the grant goals and the proposed expenditures. Many costs are reasonable but may not be allocable or necessary to reach project goals. Explanation	Budget narrative addresses each line item and demonstrates alignment between grant goals and expenditures. Nearly all costs are reasonable, allocable, and necessary to support project goals. A plan for continuing the program at a high

	after grant life is inappropriate, not measurable, or not adequate. Ideas are disjointed.	of the program beyond the life of the grant is present but does not make clear how it will be maintained at a high quality level.	quality level beyond the life of the grant is clearly articulated.
Comments: All budget items are reasonable, align to goals and a plan for continuing beyond provision of grant funds is provided. Significant \$ allocated for technology, both hardware and software but no explanation of how they are used in delivering curriculum or supporting academic growth of students.			

5. School Governance Plan and Administrative Relationships: 3

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	The school governance structure description, school staff connections, and existing relationships with EMOs and CMOs explanation is partial, vague, or unclear. Information regarding school operations, charter school leader's decision making process, and staff cohesiveness is not evident, measurable, or adequate. Relationship between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizer is poorly described. No plan for how timely and accurate data will be submitted. Ideas are disjointed.	The governance structure of the school is described but school staff connections and existing relationships with EMOs or CMOs are not adequately explained. A description of school operations, charter school leaders' decision making process, and staff cohesiveness is present. School board member recruitment process and board governance training are vaguely described. Relationship description between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizers is described but lacks ability to demonstrate lack of conflict of interest. Data submission plan described.	The governance structure of the school is clearly described, articulating connections between school staff, any existing partnerships with EMOs or CMOs are clearly defined. School operations and charter school leaders' decision making process, as well as staff cohesiveness are explained with specificity. The school board member recruitment process is methodically described. Appropriate evidence of a governance training for board members is presented. Relationship description between charter school leadership, governing board, and/or authorizers is clearly described and demonstrates no conflict of interest. Data submission plan described and demonstrates ability to submit timely and accurate data.
Comments: Recruitment is well-defined and new/annual Board training noted.			

6. Student Recruitment and Admissions Process: 3

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	Student Recruitment plan description is partial, vague, or unclear. No evidence to show compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. Public lottery process is described.	Student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and evidence of compliance with Indiana code 20-24-5 is presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.

	present.		
Comments: Plan is clearly articulated and is compliant with Indiana code 20-24-5 to include a public lottery process.			

7. Meet the Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students: 5

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	Proposal offers partial, vague, or unclear explanation of how school will complete with state and federal law to deliver services to students with disabilities, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Explanation does not seem appropriate, measurable, or adequate.	Proposal presents explanation that may be somewhat unclear to describe how school will comply with state and federal law to deliver appropriate services to students with disabilities, low-income students, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Explanation is generally, but not fully, appropriate, measurable, or adequate.	The proposal demonstrates how the school will comply with state and federal law to deliver appropriate services to students with disabilities, low-income students, English learners, homeless students, and neglected and delinquent students. Specific evidence to support the above mentioned areas is present.
Comments: School has identified solid programming and processes to meet the needs of the students it serves.			

8. Community Outreach Activities: 3

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	Evidence of parent, student, and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague, or unclear.	Evidence of parent, student, and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully appropriate.	Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, students, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented.
Comments: The school has built many relationships with the community and has a well-established plan for parent communication and participation.			

9. Fiscal Management Plan: 5

0	1-2	3-4	5-6
No description provided or cited.	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is partial, vague, or unclear. Explanation for charter school leadership	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described. The grant management process is described. Charter school leaders are mentioned as responsible	A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated. The grant management process is clearly

	responsibility for grant does not seem appropriate or adequate. Minimal or disjointed explanation for how state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is offered.	for the grant but explanation does not seem fully adequate. A description for how other state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is described but not fully adequate.	defined. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of the grants and not the CMO/EMO. A sufficient description for how other state and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement is provided.
Comments: Plan is identified but did not meet standard for fiscal management in 2 of the last 3 years.			

10. Facilities: 3

0	1	2	3
No description provided or cited.	A vague or unclear school facility plan is presented, and does not incorporate student enrollment's impact on facility needs. Transportation plan is mentioned but does not seem appropriate or adequate.	A generally appropriate school facility plan is presented, mentioned student enrollment and an adequate explanation of how student enrollment impacts facility needs. A transportation plan is described but may or may not be appropriate for student needs.	An appropriate and thorough school facility plan is presented, including how student enrollment impacts facility needs. A transportation plan appropriate for the school's student needs is presented. If transportation is not aligned with the needs of the school, this should be explained.
Comments: All segments of a facility plan are present, however, no documentation regarding inspections, etc. were provided.			

11. Signed Charter School Assurances: 6

0	6
No signed assurances provided that the authorizer, charter school developer, staff, and management organizations will fully comply with the stated activities within the sub grant and employ appropriate internal controls to manage the grant.	Signed assurances are provided that the authorizer, charter school developer, staff, and management organizations will fully comply with the stated activities within the sub grant and employ appropriate internal controls to manage the grant.
Comments: Provided	

Total Points (Out of 57): 49

Competitive Preference Points (+ Up to 3): _____

Total Score (Out of 57): ____⁴⁹____

Overall Comments:

This proposal is somewhat disorganized in its presentation. Elements are present but not presented in a way that makes it easy for an evaluator. There are numerous grammatical/phrasing errors in the proposal itself and in supporting documents.